MHRA
Modern Humanities Research Association

Review
Author(s): Raymond Furness
Review by: Raymond Furness
Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 69, No. 4 (Oct., 1974), pp. 935-936
Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3725373
Accessed: 06-02-2016 10:47 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 131.170.6.51 on Sat, 06 Feb 2016 10:47:11 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

occasional failure to match the boldness of his theories with works of literary calibre are by no means glossed over. Holz emerges in this study as a victim: to some degree of his own overbearing character, which enabled him to rise to eminence during the 1880s but not to retain the position of leadership he coveted, and of the developing 'Konkurrenzsituation' within the movement for which he was not emotionally prepared and which gradually undermined him as a writer. At some points here, however, readers may find Scheuer's amateur psychology and his use of literary works as psychological palimpsests less palatable than his general standards of literary and sociological research, for matters sexual and literary are decoded a little too easily.

Ultimately, Scheuer's thesis that Holz is a figure representative of the period rests less on details of private biography than on artistic and even socio-economic grounds: 'das Leben des Dichters Arno Holz — und auch das dichterische Werk selbst — läßt sich nur auf dem Hintergrund der kapitalistischen Gesellschaftsordnung des ausgehenden 19. und beginnenden 20. Jahrhunderts richtig erfassen. Es besteht eine Relation zwischen dem Verhalten des Dichters und der wirtschaftlich-gesellschaftlichen Struktur der wilhelminischen Zeit.' This is of course true, in the sense that there is some relationship between writer and social conditions, but dubious in suggesting that his literary work can 'only' be appreciated in this context. In many ways this book succeeds in combining the kind of generally a-political approach to the dynamics of modernism that one finds for instance in R. Poggioli's *Theory of the Avant-garde* with a socio-economic perspective based on the Marxist view of literature as a marketable commodity within a capitalist society. But it remains a biography of kinds. Whether, in his unsuccessful attempts at becoming his own literary critic, publisher, and agent rolled into one, Holz can justifiably be used to illustrate 'das Zeittypische' within the capitalist Wilhelmine society, or whether Holz's problems were not rooted in the aesthetic shortcomings of much of his Naturalist work and in his impractical nature, is a more open question than Scheuer would have one believe. Fortunately, this study does not need to stand or fall by its thesis concerning Holz's representative quality. Its merits are rather to be found in detailed analysis, in a wealth of unpublished material, and in a judicial weighing of evidence.

J. J. White

London

Französische Symbolisten in der deutschen Literatur der Jahrhundertwende (1869–1914). By Manfred Gsteiger. Bern: Francke. 1972. 324 pp. 44 Sw.Fr.

This is a detailed and illuminating study not of 'influences' but of the reception of French (and Belgian) symbolist poets in Germany and Austria between 1896 and 1914. The author has looked in depth at the literary magazines of the period, also at the different translations of Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Laforgue, Verhaeren and others, and he has brought to light both the appreciative and the disparaging comments made by critics in both Berlin and Vienna on the French literary scene.

The study falls into two halves; the first, 'Phasen der Rezeption' starts with a discussion of the reception of Baudelaire in Germany, and Manfred Gsteiger demonstrates that, as early as 1869, an appreciative article did appear, although the term 'symbolist' was not used until much later. Baudelaire's significance for the Naturalists is discussed, also Zola's role in bringing Verlaine and Mallarmé into the German literary consciousness. The detrimental effects of the Franco-Prussian war are hinted at, and the author shows that the attitude of several German critics was one of scorn, particularly when confronted with a work like *Axel*. It was the

This content downloaded from 131.170.6.51 on Sat, 06 Feb 2016 10:47:11 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

chameleon Hermann Bahr who became increasingly aware of the decline of Naturalism and the advent of a new vogue in France: Maeterlinck was the new literary name to flaunt, and 'decadence' the new slogan. The Viennese reaction is well described, also Max Nordau's rejection of the French literary scene as 'degenerate'. It is of interest that 'decadence' was the word used to describe the new atmosphere in French literature rather than 'symbolism': even when the latter term became a viable one the two areas overlapped almost completely. The journal *Pan* was open to the new ideas in France: Verlaine became the centre of interest, whereas Mallarmé was rejected as being incomprehensible. Maeterlinck continued to exert a powerful influence on German and Austrian neoromanticism, and Rilke's 'Jugendstil' attitudes are examined in this context. It was, of course, Stefan George, as Manfred Gsteiger rightly sees, who was *the* powerful intermediary between France and Germany, and his translations, discussed in the second half of the book, brought home the full flavour of the originals. Mallarmé, in spite of George's proselytizing, was slow to make an impact: after Verlaine it was Rimbaud who became a vital force in Germany, followed by Verhaeren, but now the offshoots of symbolism, 'Jugendstil' and 'Neuromantik', gave way to the new mode of feeling, which developed into Expressionism.

The second half of the study, 'Formen der Reproduktion', gives a series of translations of Mallarmé, Verlaine, Rimbaud and others in order to demonstrate the different emphases and preoccupations of the German recipients. George's translations of Mallarmé are compared with other, less gifted, versions; his liberties, paradoxically, helped him to remain faithful to the original meaning. Verlaine, very popular, found a host of translators, of whom Dehmel, Däubler, and George were the most gifted, yet the musicality of Verlaine's verse makes translation a very difficult exercise. K. L. Ammer's versions of Rimbaud are given due recognition: it was Ammer's translations which directly inspired much of Trakl's poetry. A final section looks at translations of such poets as Corbière and Gregh.

Manfred Gsteiger's book will be a source of valuable information to those whose field of study is lyric poetry at the turn of the century, that fascinating period between Naturalism and Expressionism, where the French influence is most potent. His comments on translation are pertinent and sensitive; his scholarly apparatus (particularly the references to obscure and often ephemeral journals) is to be admired. This is a book to be recommended highly for its lucidity and its thoroughness.

RAYMOND FURNESS

MANCHESTER

Diltheys Erlebnisbegriff: Entstehung, Glanzzeit und Verkümmerung eines literarhistorischen Begriffs. By KAROL SAUERLAND. (Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, NF 45) Berlin: de Gruyter. 1972. 181 pp. DM 64.

The theme of this engaging study is the development of the concept of *Erlebnis*: its origin, its historical and absolute value, its decisive formulation by Dilthey as an aesthetic category, and the withering away of its essential Diltheyan qualities in the age of new artistic challenges and technical artifices such as Dada, montage and experiments, and concrete poetry. Nowadays, the expression *Erlebnis* has to a great degree become outdated, or it can function only as a partial, rather subjective aesthetic term, vaguely linked with *Wahrnehmung*, *Eindruck*, *Erfahrung*, *Stimmung*. The author holds that a modern revival of the concept of *Erlebnis* can perhaps prove fruitful, if it is used as a social or historical — not absolute — category, and integrated into a comprehensive system of literary criticism.

This content downloaded from 131.170.6.51 on Sat, 06 Feb 2016 10:47:11 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions